3/3/70

Dear Harold,

Today I received your letters concerning the Fisher letter (a copy of which I still haven't gotten but soon expect) plus your letter to Look re Nichols.

Bravo on your response to Fisher. I doubt (but cannot be certain) that he will respond. He is surprising(remember the one of mine that he answered) but then remember that he still has not answered the follow-up to that. I appreciate your sending me the notes on your response to him so that I too could know what was going on.

As for the matter with Nichols, it is quite sad. I wonder how LOOK will react especially since it could tie them up in legal matters. I also wonder if this could open their eyes to you.

I was reading over Lane's CITIZEN'S DISSENT in which I was sure to look for references to you. I took especial notice to the one with a man whose name I believe was Kaplan--the one who called you a poor chicken farmer with little ability. How do you react to these sort of things? I am thoroughly appalled by those who try to discredit the work of someone by making personal attacks. SCAV & CRITICS is a perfect example. First they ahve Sylvia call you "odd." Next they torture your words and call you an "assassination paranoia." Once they've gotten you down to a silly old man who plays with birds (and to them, no doubt, you are not a man unless you play with guns) they can move in for their fake kill. They take what I regard as the most minor part of your work and disprove it (some of the stuff with the Altgens picture in WWII). Yet never do they face the important, the undeniable things.

What do you know about McCloy and the SBT? I know from Inquest that he was a real advocate of it. If you examine the record (and for the most part here you have noted the relevant testimony), McCloy comes off as Specter s pimp on the single bullet job. He made obvious efforts to get Shaneyfelt to testify that the film could be showing JFK and Connally being hit at the same time. And there is the fact (which I discovered some time ago) that the reconstruction of frame 225 was faked. It is really of 226. There is significance behind that. I was just wondering.

I found something which should interest you and Dick. It concerns what Frazier said in NO about not making an exam for blood on 399. This I got from the Hatcher, Jury, and Weller Firearms book, p. 306. It pertains to examination of evidence when received in lab. "If the bullet has not already been cleaned with alcohol or other solvent to remove blood, mud, and grease, it should be soaked free of these."

I am awfully rushed now.

Still,

Howard

cc. Dick